

Comments in Response to Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking MB Docket No. 04-233

I submit the following comments in response to the Localism Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (the "NPRM"), released Jan. 24, 2008, in MB Docket No. 04-233.

Many of the proposals in NPRM, contrary to the FCC's stated objectives, would harm both localism and diversity of viewpoints.

The true wellsprings of localism and diversity are smaller market radio stations and stations offering specialized programming (including religion, foreign language, ethnic and alternative programming). These types of stations also serve as important gateways for new entrants seeking business opportunities in broadcasting – increasing ownership among those traditionally underrepresented.

But just as major operating costs are quickly rising, and more Americans are turning to new media, the NPRM proposes measures that would substantially raise costs – something that will be keenly felt among small market and specialized programming broadcasters. Just this year, our electric and insurance costs will increase over ten percent while revenues are off over fifteen percent due to the slow economic times in the retail sector. The rational economic response will be service cutbacks or outright shutdowns. Neither outcome is in the public interest.

One of these ill-advised proposals would force radio stations to curtail reliance on labor-saving technology. An end to unstaffed operations will not improve responsiveness to a local community. To the contrary, it would lead our stations to broadcast fewer hours, shut down two altogether, and not build one that we currently have a CP for. Unattended operation with proper safeguards has helped small stations provide more service through efficiency. Take that away, and the Commission will create strong disincentive for stations to stay on during the late evening or early morning hours, hours during which very little revenue is generated. The increased operational costs will lead new entrepreneurs, including women and minorities, to look elsewhere to invest their savings and sweat equity.

The Commission must also reject proposal that would further limit where broadcasters can locate their main studios. The Commission acted in the public interest when it adopted rules many years ago to permit stations greater flexibility in selecting the location of their main studios, particularly in situations in which a broadcaster operates stations licensed to several nearby communities. If the Commission were to force each station to establish its main studio only in that station's community of license, the result would be that broadcasters -- particularly small market and speciality programming broadcasters -- would have to divert their limited financial resources from supporting and enhancing quality programming to covering additional and unnecessary real estate costs. Since this is not economically feasible, these stations will just go dark with the community having no service.

The FCC should also jettison proposals forcing stations to give away airtime to community groups. One proposal would even enforce public access requirements, similar to cable PEG channels. Cable has dozens, even hundreds of channels from which it can profit, but smaller market radio and stations serving small specialized audiences do not. Free is not really free to those who struggle every day just to keep the electricity flowing, the programming going, and the local news covered.

Smaller stations are keenly attuned to the communities they serve – it is how they remain in business. But the balance is delicate, and the Commission must not take action that will tip the balance so stations cut back on service or drop out. There is no 'public interest' in service that is both diminished and less diverse.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature

Date

Name

Address

Title (if any)

Phone

Organization (if any)